

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT FOR:

Safe Harbor

| DOCUMENT ANALYSIS | | OBSERVATION | | COMPLIANCE | |
|--|--------------|---|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Tutor Qualifications | Satisfactory | Lesson matches original description | Meeting Standard (3) | Criminal Background Checks | |
| Recruiting Materials | | Instruction is clear | Meeting Standard (3) | Health/safety laws & regulations | |
| Academic Program | | Time on task is appropriate | Meeting Standard (3) | Financial viability | |
| Progress Reporting | Satisfactory | Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable | Meeting Standard (3) | | |
| Assessment and Individual Program Design | Satisfactory | Student/instructor ratio: 8:1; 6:1 & 2:1 | Meeting Standard (3) | | |

(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since Safe Harbor's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2006-2007 school year, an observation and only a limited document analysis was completed for the 2007-2008 school year).

ACTION NEEDED:

None

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Safe Harbor
REVIEWER: MC

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: 3/18/08

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

| COMPONENT | DOCUMENTATION NEEDED | DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only) | UNSATISFACTORY | SATISFACTORY | COMMENTS |
|----------------------|---|--|----------------|--------------|--|
| Tutor qualifications | ALL of the following: -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of professional development Professional development agendas Tutor stipend forms for professional development Tutor certificates from pd | | X | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional development is provided on Wilson Reading, Everyday Math, and an orientation to the Safe Harbor program. Professional development covers placement tests, games, lesson structure, and lesson plans. Orientation includes information about attendance and developing individual learning plans. Tutors receive certificates for completing the Reading and Math workshops. |
| Progress Reporting | ALL of the following: -Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports) -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SES agreements Progress reports Documentation of reports sent (dates or parent signatures). Timeline for sending progress reports SES contract | | X | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report from one district surveyed indicates that progress reports are submitted in a timely manner. Progress reports include all necessary information from IDOE progress reporting checklist. Progress reports provide information about SES agreement goals, progress toward meeting goals, areas of strength and weakness, and assessment results. Progress reports are sent monthly. Progress reports are signed by parents. A pre-SES workshop was held for parents. Additionally, an exit conference will be held with parents upon completion of the SES program. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| Assessment and Individual Program Design | <p>ALL of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student - Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out) -Explanation and evidence regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual learning plans • Individual profile of progress • Explanation of process to develop learning plans • Correlation between pre-assessment and standards | | X | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning plans and individual folders for each student were available on-site. Files are kept for each student group, and tutors pull files prior to beginning each tutoring session. They are used for lesson planning. • Foundations description explains exactly where students should be placed based on Foundations assessment score. Individual learning plans are developed based on pre-assessments and teacher anecdotal information (from parents, etc.). • Individual profile of progress for math includes skill gaps in math based on the math baseline assessment. • Individual learning plans include goals for math and English/language arts. ILP includes objectives as well as goals for mastery rate using the assessment. Students must meet 80% in each objective to be considered as meeting the goal. There is a date for estimated goal completion. • Students are grouped based on levels. • Individual learning plan goals match goals from SES agreements. • Lessons/goals in SES agreement focus on areas identified as skill gaps in the pre-assessments for Math and Reading. • Correlational studies were provided for connections between the assessment and Indiana standards, as well as specific standards that are covered by the assessments. Copies of assessments were also provided. |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Safe Harbor

SITE: Knapp Elementary, 321 Bolka Avenue, Michigan City

TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): K.M., J.M

NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 2

DATE: 3/5/08

REVIEWER: MC/ST

TIME OF OBSERVATION: 3:15

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving “1 or 2 points” on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

| COMPONENT | 1 Below Standard | 2 Approaching Standard | 3 Meeting Standard | 4 Exceeding Standard | REVIEWER COMMENTS |
|---|------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Lesson matches original description in provider application | | | X | | Students worked in two groups. The larger group started out with a review of what was covered previously (schwa sound) and then worked using whiteboards. They were practicing letter blends and making syllables. The tutor had the students repeat a word (gumdrop), repeat the blend, and then write the two letters that blend together. As a group, they practiced separating the words and circling the blended letters on their whiteboards. Students had to write additional words on their whiteboards and continue circling the blends. At the end of the whiteboard activity, the tutor reviewed the concepts and then got the students ready to work on workbook pages on blends. The other group (the smaller group) worked on spelling simpler words. They spelled them out using letter boards (letter tiles and a whiteboard). The tutor asked the students to identify other consonants that could be used to change the words that the students had spelled out (i.e., mat instead of cat). The tutor challenged the students to make as many additional words as they could using different consonants. The tutor helped students sound out words to help them know if the word was a real word or not, and used hand signals to help students grasp the sounds. Lessons observed appeared to match description in originally approved and amended application. |
| | | | X | | Although it was not clear what students were working on when reviewers arrived (they were sitting in a circle talking about good behavior), once the second tutor arrived and the students split into two groups, students appeared to have a very good idea of what they were supposed to be working on. In the larger group, the tutor introduced the day's |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| Instruction is clear | | | | | activity by reminding students they had previously worked on blends and today they were continuing that work. The tutor practiced in the larger group before having students write words individually on their whiteboards. The tutor also made sure to review what had been covered in the activity prior to moving on to the next activity. Instruction matched the lesson plan in the lesson plan packet available on-site, which also made it clear to reviewers what was being covered. In the second group, because no lesson plan was made available, it wasn't as clear what the lesson objective was. However, students appeared to know what was expected of them and how to complete activities. |
| Time on task is appropriate | | | X | | When reviewers arrived, students had not yet begun working on tutoring activities, as the tutor was trying to get the larger group (8:1) calmed down and ready to begin the tutoring. Some students were having trouble staying in the circle. However, when the second tutor arrived and the groups split up, students became quiet and ready to work. In both groups, tutors kept students on task (writing words on their whiteboards or spelling using letter tiles). The tutor of the large group asked individual students to answer questions to ensure that they were participating. The students seemed engaged in the lesson and appeared to enjoy using the whiteboards. In the smaller group, students remained on task while working using their letter tiles. The small group atmosphere in the second group was conducive to staying on task, as the tutor interacted constantly with each student. |
| Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable | | | X | | Lesson plans were available on-site. The tutor of the larger group clearly followed the lesson plan in the lesson plan packet, including activities and strategies that had been identified in the lesson plan. The tutor appeared to have a good working knowledge of the plan for the day, which helped minimize transition time. The tutor ensured that students were involved and participating in the lesson and made sure to review what the activity had covered before moving on to practice using workbook pages. The tutor also made sure to review what had been covered in previous lessons and connect previous activities to the current activity. The other tutor utilized a variety of methods to help students use consonants to come up with new words, including hand gestures, helping the students sound out the words, and helping students spell the words using sounds. Both tutors appeared familiar with the curriculum. |
| Student/instructor ratio: Ratio matches that reported in original provider application | | | X | | When reviewers arrived, students were in a group of 8:1. After a few minutes, a second tutor arrived and students broke into two groups that were 2:1 and 6:1. All ratios met 8:1 ratio described in amended application. |